DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 333 CG 005 669

AUTHOR	Wheeler, Burton M.
TITLE	Students and the Shaping of the Curriculum.
INSTITUTION	American Coll. Personnel Association.; Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo.
PUB DATE	18 Mar 70
NOTE	18p.; Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, March 16-18, 1970
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, *Curriculum Development, *Curriculum Planning, Problems, Student Attitudes, Student Opinion, *Student Participation, *Student School Relationship, Teacher Influence, *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Whenever the issue of student participation in curriculum reform is raised, the opposition can be expected to express itself in two ways: (1) the rational argument which justifies faculty control in terms of rightness; and (2) entrenchment or keeping control away from the activists. There are costs and risks, as well as potential gains in greater student participation. There are also costs and risks to denying student participation. While defending the prerogatives of the faculty with regard to curriculum planning in the fields of specialized, preprofessional training, students should be involved in working out effective ways of accomplishing the real objectives of liberal education. Reasons for student involvement include: (1) faculty often solve curriculum problems by adding courses; (2) often faculty have no skills for curriculum development; and (3) the experience and insights gained by these students who do help plan will become part of the student culture. Problems that are possible with student planning include: (1) many students feel they cannot change anything around them; (2) students become entrapped in their own organizational patterns; (3) students are anxious for adult approval; and (4) a sense of impermanence hovers over student groups. (KJ)

ED041999

STUDENTS AND THE SHAPING OF THE CURRICULUM

Address by

Burton M. Wheeler, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

American College Personnel Association Conference, March 18, 1970

When I address a group with which I am unfamiliar on a topic as controversial as the present one I am tempted to try to summarize all that I have said in every other address I have given on the topic. The temptation springs from a certain cowardice, I suppose, from the fear of being misunderstood. In order to treat a bit more adequately the specific topic I have been assigned, however, I am determined not to yield fully to that temptation. My views on the causes of the crisis besetting higher education or the sources of student radicalism and dissent you may attempt to deduce. My fears of what may lie in store for us all, you may sense. My values may be all too apparent. However, for the next forty-five minutes I do hope to remain something of an enigma, for as Dean of a college of arts and sciences I have come to recognize that unless one learns to savor the paradoxical and enigmatic he has little chance of appearing wise. Like some of you, I have at times reached that point of agony where even the appearance of wisdom seems a blessed state. Perhaps all of us foolish enough to speak or write on "The Student in the University" are merely insignificant imitations of Kafka striving to state with great clarity and precision the incomprehensibility of the incomprehensible.

CG005-669

As a preamble to my comments on students and the shaping of the curriculum, I should like to recall a passage from Charles Dickens' Hard Times, surely a suitable title:

> "Now, what I want is, Facts. Teach these boys and girls nothing but Facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Plant nothing else, and root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon Facts: nothing else will ever be of service to them. This is the principle upon which I bring up my own children, and this is the principle on which I bring up these children. Stick to facts, sir!"

> The scene was a plain, bare, monotonous vault of a schoolroom, and the speaker's square forefinger emphasized his observations by underscoring every sentence with a line on the schoolmaster's sleeve. The emphasis was helped by the speaker's square wall of a forehead, which had his eyebrows for its base, while his eyes found commodious cellarage in two dark caves, overshadowed by the wall. The emphasis was helped by the speaker's mouth, which was wide, thin, and hard set. The emphasis was helped by the speaker's voice, which was inflexible, dry, and dictatorial. The emphasis was helped by the speaker's hair, which bristled on the skirts of his bald head, a plantation of firs to keep the wind from its shining surface, all covered with knobs, like the crust of a plum pie, as if the head had scarcely warehouse room for the hard facts stored inside. The speaker's obstinate carriage, square coat, square legs, square shoulders--nay, his very neckcloth, trained to take him by the throat with an unaccommodating grasp, like a stubborn fact, as it was,--all helped the emphasis.
>
> "In this life, we want nothing but Facts, sir; nothing but Facts!"
>
> The speaker, and the schoolmaster, and the third grown person present, all backed a little, and swept with their eyes the inclined plane of little vessels then and there arranged in order, ready to have imperial gallons of facts poured into them until they were full to the brim. (Hard Times, I, i.)

In the slightly more than one hundred years which have passed since Charles Dickens described this wretched scene, in the steady march of progress we have improved our classrooms and have changed our dress and pedagogical styles. We have split the atom, broken the sound barrier, explored the moon and computerized registration. Seats of higher education have proven themselves to be organisms capable of parthenogenesis. As colleges and universities have multiplied, so have facts. And until recently still the vessels were arranged on inclined planes ready, we assumed, to have gallons of facts poured into them.

It is easy to satirize American higher education, and perhaps easier yet to enjoy such satire. The rhetoric of college catalogues has always seemed a bit hyperbolic when compared with pep rallies, greek sings, or multiple choice examinations. We have long been accustomed to recognizing that between our aspirations and our achievements stretched mile after mile of

arid plains. We have experimented, innovated, renovated and accommodated, but never with a very real sense of urgency.

That a sense of urgency has arisen among academicians in the late 1960's, few would dispute. That sense of urgency is, I think, sharpened by the fact that the rhetoric of college radicals has a marked similarity to that of traditional college catalogues acclaiming the commitment of the institution to liberating the whole man, and advancing society toward perfection. Nor have we been comforted by the fact that the distance between the stated aspirations of college radicals and their achievements is as great as that between our own aspirations and achievements. Higher education in the United States has reached a crisis stage and there are many outside our universities who indicate that they are prepared "to set it in order."

The nature of the crisis, however, is rather different from that which catches the fancy of the news media. It is not long hair and beards, minis or maxis, sit-ins or arson. It is not even drugs and sex which certainly pose serious problems in their own right. Rather, it is a sense of confusion about the purposes and proper directions of higher education. The disparity between student expectations of a university and faculty expectations has probably never been so great. Further, both faculty and students are divided into those with a professional or preprofessional orientation and those who are principally concerned with the quality of liberal education. There are those who see the university as an academy and those who see it as an instrument for radical action. We have talked of communication and community in the belief that given time we not only could but would agree about goals and objectives. Now I sense that there may not be time, and even if there were, there may not be agreement.

One of the more serious and perennial controversies is that between those who see the university as an instrument of society producing the trained manpower to maintain that society and the few who see both the society and the university as instruments for man's survival, means of enabling the individual to attain his fullest potential as a human being.

Quotations from recent publications illustrate the controversy. The first statement is that of Richard F. Rosenberg, Chairman of the Oregon State Educational Coordinating Council.

> I think that one thing that must be understood is that the public has an interest in higher education because higher education contributes to the progress and growth of our society. Our educational institutions endeavor to prepare the professional people, managers, researchers, and artists who will provide leadership for, and participate in, an advanced technological state. Virtually every economic, social and cultural endeavor is dependent on higher education's production of this skilled and informed manpower. (Richard L. Rosenberg, "Higher Education: The Public Interest," Value Change and Power Conflict, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969, p. 48.

A similar view, expressed by Admiral Rickover in his book Education and Freedom, "We must upgrade our schools in order to guarantee the future prosperity and freedom of the Republic," led Professor Wayne Booth of the University of Chicago to comment:

> In Admiral Rickover's statement, the schools must be upgraded in order to guarantee future prosperity, that is, we improve education for the sake of some presumed social good.
>
> I seldom find anyone putting it the other way round: we must guarantee prosperity so that we can improve the schools, insure the development of certain kinds of persons, both as teachers and as students. (Wayne Booth, "Is There Any Knowledge That A Man Must Have," The Knowledge Most Worth Having, University of Chicago, 1967, pp. 16-17)

Do our colleges and universities exist for the society and its self-propagation, or to enable its members to become fully human? Is the problem posed simply one of semantics and emphasis or is there a significant distinction between the language and intent of Mr. Rosenberg and Mr. Booth? I think there is and that the difference lies precisely where campus radicals express their concerns. Are students raw material to be shaped to the purposes of an intractable system, small machines which enable the big machine to function smoothly? Or are they individuals with inalienable rights, who participate in a society which exists for their well-being and the well-being of all its citizens and which must continually be reshaped to meet changing needs?

Campus radicals are easily lampooned because they are of a privileged class. Their parents often are prosperous and

prominent. If they really knew what it's like to earn bread by the sweat of the brow, runs the lampoon, they wouldn't have time for marching, picketing, and trouble-making. Since I have already lapsed into biblical prose, let me cite a proverb, giving it a contemporary reading: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Products of a depression and several wars, the fathers set out to achieve success which could be measured by income and/or position. They now have their suburban homes or luxury apartments, positions of importance, and often wealth beyond their fondest expectations of some thirty years ago. But too often the wealth has not brought happiness, and the fruits of their labors seem of no <u>real</u> value. For what promotes real value is not that which hastens and expedites consumption but that which introduces some qualitative difference into the life of a person. How often have our students heard their fathers or mothers speak with joy and pride of their work? Even as educators, I fear the impression we give of our endeavors is one of frustration, futility, and sheer busyness. Is it surprising that the children's teeth are set on edge and that even when they do not have an alternative, some of them set themselves stubbornly against following similar routes and assuming similar roles?

In spite of the rhetorical questions with which I have flailed you, I trust the relevance of the problem to my subject is clear. For some decades, universities and colleges have given their primary attention to fulfilling the demands laid upon it by society. If more scientists are needed because of Sputnik, we produce them. If fewer Ph. D's are needed because of the glut on the market, we will cease producing them. If research is needed for various departments of government we will do it, for a price. If it is no longer needed, we will cease doing it, but complain because the oh-so-helpful funds are also terminated. A Secretary of Defense was once ridiculed for proclaiming, "What's good for General Motors is good for the country." We have behaved as though "What's convenient for the government is good for the universities." Obviously I am not at all convinced that doing what is convenient for the government is necessarily in the best interest of the country, or its citizens. Student

concern for discovering themselves and doing what is meaningful to themselves certainly has its absurd excesses. Nevertheless, their desire to assert their right to decide how they will spend their futures rather than submit to channeling is surely a healthy attitude. Our problem is convincing them that they have a future.

In a recent article in the College Board Review (Winter, '69-70, No. 74, p. 7), William Boyd cited evidence that 90% of freshmen entering midwestern colleges in the fall of 1969 believed that they should "help design the curriculum." Although my own impression is that this figure is rather high and certainly does not represent the number who would actually work at such a task themselves, there is significant evidence that students are both disgruntled with what they are getting in our current curriculum and dissatisfied that they do not play a more active role in shaping alternatives.

Perhaps no privilege is more precious to the faculty than control of the curriculum. In many cases, faculties have wrested control of the curriculum from arbitrary administrations or boards of trustees. They also have cause for some pride in what they have created, particularly if the criteria used for judging success are derived from professional and disciplinary concerns. Although I think it would be very difficult to prove, we possibly do produce better trained and more competent chemists, psychologists, historians, literary critics or physicists than the colleges of thirty or forty years ago.

Whenever the issue of student participation in curriculum reform is raised, the opposition can be expected to express itself in two distinctive ways. The first is rational argument which justifies faculty control in terms of rightness, propriety and the best interest of all concerned. The second form of opposition is entrenchment. Possessing control of the curriculum, the faculty, at least in a university setting, can with some confidence assume that student activists have neither the organization nor the staying power to successfully mount a frontal assault on their fortresses. There may be momentary difficulties and perhaps even calculated losses, but over the years attrition will tell more heavily on student activists than on the faculty.

If this general assessment of the situation is essentially accurate, it follows that sustained and creative involvement of students in curriculum planning is likely to occur only if there are major changes in the attitudes of faculties.

Thus far I have proceeded as though student participation in curriculum planning were so obviously a desirable goal that it needed no defense. I may also seem to have implied that only an overly paternalistic and entrenched faculty stands in the way of so desirable an objective. I am not sosimplistic. There are costs and risks, as well as potential gains in greater student participation. But there are also costs and risks to denying student participation.

Students do seem more immediately susceptible to fads. A steady diet of encounter groups, "I Ching", and women's liberation would assuredly not be in their best interest, but the fear that students are interested only in the ephemerally relevent seems groundless to me. Courses spawned in "free universities" or introduced into the curriculum at student instigation are intended to supplement, not supplant more standard offerings. In large part they represent a striving for another format for learning than the lecture course.

When students strive to participate in curriculum development, rarely do they evince much concern for courses which constitute their professional training. In discussing curriculum revision, we should distinguish between courses which are professional in their orientation and those which are part of the general curriculum related to "liberal education." The major difficulty is that professionalism has become so dominant in our departments, and our departments so autonomous that few courses on most campuses are genuinely designed to meet the purposes of "liberal education." Even introductory courses most frequently serve as stepping stones for the potential major. Beyond such freshman courses, I would venture to say, 90% of university offerings are implemented, if not designed, to discourage those not inclined toward or capable of such specialization. This, it seems to me, is the travesty of higher education.

I have no intention of developing a case for the elimination of forms of specialization from the undergraduate curriculum. That a student should become competent in a specific area of study or in a particular discipline is defensible on several grounds. To function effectively or to function at all, this complex society requires large numbers of highly trained scientists and technologists. I would add a further point. There are students who will obtain their greatest joy from the successful pursuit of these areas. In terms of social needs and the needs of some individuals, specialization can and should be defended. The desire of many students to move as early as possible into their specialized fields is a feature common to most campuses, and not one that need be discouraged. A physicist or microbiologist must pursue a rather carefully structured course of study to become proficient. Normally such students recognize the propriety of faculty control of that sequence. I see no serious difficulties in this area.

On the other hand, rarely do even the most ardent faculty proponents of specialization contend that more than fifty percent of a student's four year academic load must be devoted to his professional training. More frequently, in the humanities and social sciences, no more than 25 percent of a student's time is demanded for his preparation in his major field of study. Thus by our present system, we reserve between fifty and seventy-five percent of the curriculum for general education. To what end?

Since the surrender of the classical curriculum and the introduction of the elective system at Harvard in the late nineteenth century, faculties have struggled with the concept of "General Education." Daniel Bell's Reforming General Education surveys the attempts over a number of decades at Columbia, Harvard and Chicago to resolve the problem. While such debates have continued, however, the emasculation of general education has proceeded apace by virtue of the dependence upon disciplinary divisions to offer virtually all courses. By the very nature of things, departmental courses tend to drift toward specialization.

Much of our difficulty with General Education derives from our reluctance to surrender the belief that there is a particular

body of knowledge that every educated man should know. Perhaps only the tremendous advances in scholarship and the nearly unbelievable constriction of our planet could lay that belief to rest. In this age, we cannot successfully argue that a course in Western Civilization is more essential than a course in Eastern or African Civilization. Is knowledge of a foreign language more essential than knowledge of advanced mathematics, economics or psychology? And when we move to the humanities, the choices are equally difficult--Bach or Rembrandt, Dante or Kant? In the article alluded to earlier, Professor Both notes: "....a man can be ignorant even of Shakespeare, Aristotle, Beethoven and Einstein and be a man for a' that--if he has learned how to think his own thoughts, experience beauty for himself and choose his own actions." (Booth, p. 27) But this is precisely where we have failed and are failing. No matter how many facts a student learns about any of the masters in whatever field, he is but a container of facts--one of Dickens' pitiful vessels--until he has developed a capacity to speculate, discriminate and assimilate.

While defending the prerogatives of the faculty with regard to curriculum planning in the fields of specialized, preprofessional training, I contend that we must involve our students in working out effective ways of accomplishing the real objectives of liberal education. It is generally recognized now that students can move from virtually any undergraduate field in the humanities or social sciences to a related field at the graduate level and perform quite successfully, although a very brief period of remedial studies may be necessary. Certainly law schools, and graduate schools of business and social work, have long recognized that it was to their advantage to recruit widely from various undergraduate majors. What is necessary is not encyclopedic knowledge of a particular field, nor even a highly particularized disciplinary competence, but rather the capacity to think independently, to know how to go about answering a question or resolving a problem, and to make value judgments that rest upon a coherent understanding of the interdependency of men in modern society.

There are five secondary reasons why we must turn to student participation in curriculum planning to accomplish the objectives of liberal education:

1) While the faculty is well trained and well suited to make curriculum decisions in the areas of their specialties, those who have worked on curriculum for liberal education soon discover that nothing in their training has provided them with skills special to this problem. Although they are more knowledgeable of the ways of academia, they are as uncertain as undergraduates about the best way to effect a liberal education. One notes that the models which most professors bring to bear on their attitudes toward curriculum have a startling resemblance to the type of program common to their own undergraduate college.
2) Faculty members and administrators have a distressing habit of solving curriculum problems by adding more courses. The proliferation of courses may be one of our major problems already. Few students could be convinced that the solution to the ills they are conscious of in our present curriculum are subject to correction by the addition of more of the same.
3) Faculty members have set assumptions about what is academic and what is non-academic that are often unacceptable to students. As you know from your own campus, those areas which may be described as extra-curricular are likely to receive short shrift from the faculty and hence the administration. Although faculties are prepared to admit that the total college experience of students ought to include extra-curricular experiences, they generally disclaim responsibility for such areas and rarely, very rarely see in them opportunities for education.
4) We forget that the word curriculum is derived from the Latin word "to run." Even the phrase "course of study" rarely conjurs up the vision of a physical course to be traversed. But for the student, whether or not he is an etymologist, there is always the awareness that he is being asked to run, and run, and run. But he would like to know where he is running, what the objectives are and what else he must give up before he can decide realistically whether the race is

worth the running. I think too highly of my faculty colleagues to assume that they really expect their students either docilely to run the race because their drill instructor assures them that it is good for them or to react any other way than with antagonism if they are warned of the dire consequences of not running. They have run to the whistle of the drill instructor in high school and the joy of running for its own sake is rarely in them, particularly if the course appears suspiciously like an obstacle course designed to maintain a meritocracy.

5) Although it is true that very few students are likely to participate actively in curriculum planning, the experience and insights gained by those who do readily become part of the student culture. Partially because students do have better access to other students than members of the faculty, there is great potential for dissemination of educational objectives through student participants. One of the striking features of the contemporary scene is the extraordinary degree of peer identification among most students. Although they may distrust particular student leaders or particular student governmental structures, they overwhelmingly support the principle of student involvement in decision making and are generally willing to accept decisions where they believe student points of view have been fairly represented.

The primary reason for student participation in the shaping of the curriculum is more complex and difficult to state. In short it is this: we do not know how we can most effectively get where we wish to go. Our educational vision has been hampered by our habits and our fears. To effect our desired ends, we need student contribution. We must first convince students that our universities and our society are dynamic rather than static. Secondly, we must explode the Phoenix myth. The rather pervasive belief among some students that if we can but destroy this society a beautiful new bird will arise from the flames is ahistorical, apolitical and inhumane. However, the view that today's student is merely suffering the pangs of adolescence and will develop an uncritical acceptance of the status quo is potentially suicidal.

Our students sense, probably more acutely than do we the dangers that lie ahead in the destruction of our environment, the heightening of racial tensions, the continued creation of weapon systems which we may not be able to control, and the increasing disparity between the "haves" and "have-nots" of our world.

If we are not as yet prepared to draft the blueprints of a new society or even a new university, we cannot delay in preparing a citizenry which can envision, plan, and implement a saner and more just society. To do so, we must bring to the task of re-shaping the university all the imagination, energy, and creativity at our disposal. These qualities do exist among many of our students. Conjoined with the experience and deeper awareness of history possessed by our faculty, the idealism and drive of students may enable us to break through the patterns which presently stultefy both students and members of the faculty.

Surely there are ways now that we can proceed toward the transformation of our academic patterns. If we dispense with the concept that there is an established body of knowledge which every educated man must have, if we rid ourselves of the notion, surely spurious, that one introductory course enables a student to see how a discipline operates; and,if we accept the premise that our energies must be directed toward the development of clarity of thinking and a clearer, more cohesive system of values, certain tasks appear inevitable.

We can no longer rely as heavily as we have in the past on the standard course structure. The lecture system with infrequent discussion groups, usually expected to arrive at a predetermined point, has been the primary vehicle of our system, reinforced with tests, term papers, and occasional recitation. Too frequently tests, term papers and recitations have existed only for the purpose of establishing a grade rather than as a vital part of the learning process. For example, students rarely receive a detailed critique of their final examinations. Nor does it occur to them that they should, for they, too, see it principally as an instrument for establishing a grade. Yet here of all places is a need for careful evaluation by student and instructor of the quality of performance, the sources of strength and the causes of error.

We have simply allowed our system of course credits and marketable transcripts to dominate us and distract us from our educational objectives.

Until we recognize that the lecture system is too frequently a form of spectator sport, we are unlikely to produce students who possess the intellectual independence that we profess to strive for. Even in seminars, as instructors we too confidently and easily dominate the situation. Our students remain passive and dependent, not because we intend it, but because we are not sufficiently devoted to enabling them to achieve complete, critical independence. Recently in reading the research paper of a graduate student, I became so conscious of dependence upon authorities that I finally felt compelled to say, "Whenever you are afflicted with the urge to quote authority X, Y or Z because he has said it so much better, consider finding something better to say." Although we give lip-service to the concept almost daily, we have failed to convey successfully to our students the need for them to think for themselves.

Perhaps one of the reasons we find our students in so passive and dependent a role is linked to another failure. One of our greatest resources for effective teaching is almost completely untapped--the students themselves. Anyone who has experimented with student criticism of student papers knows how quickly they become critically perceptive--in dealing with someone else's work. With experience and supervision, they can also become extraordinarily effective as discussion leaders. We have not tapped this resource because to do so is time consuming, but it may be one of the ways to establish the confidence and independency toward which we must strive.

I detect one other serious difficulty in our formal course structure. On most campuses there are relatively few courses that deal explicitly with values. As faculty members we assume that values are implicit in the entire structure of our fields, but rarely do we make them explicit and invite challenge. With the erosion of religious commitment in the Judeo-Christian context, with the turning of departments of philosophy to analytic philosophy many students confront a void. It is instructive to

consider the sequential popularity among undergraduates of Salinger, then Golding, then Camus, and now Hesse, novelists who deal expressly with values. By means of departmental courses or through supra-departmental offerings, we must turn explicitly to issues of values, to the grounds of idealism, for one of the tragic things we are witnessing on our campuses is the death of the American dream.

But surely courses are not the only means available to the university to improve the educational process. In a colloquium on the purposes of education on our campus some sixteen months ago, I argued for a reduction of the standard course load with the substitution of tutorial equivalents which would not be limited to academic subjects. I shall not repeat the details of that proposal or attempt to justify the plan, for each campus must strive to determine what is most effective in its particular setting. The substance of the proposal, however, is simple. Students have often contended that their most valuable experiences on campus have arisen from extra-curricular activities. As a faculty member I have winced before the claim and generally refused to believe it. Yet for some students going into fields which are not dependent on the structured sequence of course work it may be so. One must wonder how much more effective such activities as campus newspaper work, social organizations, community action programs, and campus government might become if we recognized that they are learning situations and attempted to bring to bear upon them some of the resources now limited to the classroom. The possibilities for assisting a student to think through his objectives, to periodically review his procedures, to challenge his goals and to evaluate his accomplishments are extensive, yet largely untapped.

Particularly with regard to student involvement in social action programs have we failed to give the guidance and support requisite to satisfactory learning situations. By stipulating that these are extra-curricular activities, we have made it clear that they were of lesser importance than course work. Although there has been some tendency to expand work-study and field experience, we are, as a national system of higher education

still far short of utilizing the potential either of the existing situations or of our students.

Perhaps the most effective statement of the necessity of community involvement has come from our black students as they have worked toward clarification of their objectives in the various Afro-American or Black Studies programs. They sense the necessity of involving themselves in the communities from which they come as a corollary of their academic work, a means of testing the relevance of their learning and a reminder of what they are training for.

Another reason has been set forth by Dr. Rosemary Park:

> Is it indeed enough to study and present? Does the university not have a responsibility to sensitize and encourage its students to action in the cause of social justice? Should not its educational program demonstrate its own concern, for instance, exerting all its capacities to provide education for disadvantage minorities?
>
> Unless the university proves by such actions that it is concerned about justice, all its talk about truth may be mere rhetoric, too. Perhaps it is not that the younger group so much denigrates truth and rational process, though on occasion they appear to, as that they see the requirements of justice so much more clearly. (Rosemary Park, "Value Change and Power Conflict: The Administrative Interest," Value Change and Power Conflict, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969, p. 120).

A third reason, perhaps more compelling than either of the others is the strong desire of students today to gain experience outside the academic womb. We occasionally must remind ourselves, particularly on campuses where the great majority of students are from upper middle class suburbia, of the extraordinary limitations of such students. Their apparent sophistication too easily blinds us to the fact that such sophistication has come largely vicariously. Few have ever profited from the experiences of paper routes, clerking, and all the jobs we have traditionally associated with American adolescence. For many, counseling at summer camps is the only non-school responsibility they have had. They sense the need to test themselves, to discover whether they have the competence to cope with the real world. Both their

need and their desire are justifications for extending the educational program of the university beyond the formal classroom. Although raw experience in and of itself is educational, that is not what I contend we must provide. Rather, we must encourage types of experience which can be subjected to the reflection and inquiry for which an academic community exists. I think it obvious that no satisfactory pattern is likely to develop without extensive student participation in the planning.

What I have said thus far reflects my conviction that new institutional patterns must develop on our campuses which can bring faculty and students into active cooperation in shaping the future of colleges. Virtually every college I know of has taken at least token steps along these lines with varying results. On some campuses such steps have exacerbated the student's sense of powerlessness and inequality. On others, constructive action has begun. You are fully aware, however, that I have made no reference to deans of students, student activity personnel or counselors. That omission had to be deliberate in an address prepared for such a conference as this.

Quite frankly, I am not at all certain what role you can best play in the current crisis of higher education. I do not profess to have extensive familiarity with the roles you now play or envision for yourselves. My limited experience, however, convinces me that you have already recognized that you must redefiné your expectations and redirect your energies. Perhaps by enumerating some of the problems I see in implementing a program of student participation in curriculum planning, I can suggest some of the possibilities open to you.

1. Exceeding the militancy of the few is the confusion, self-denigration, and despair of many. Our campuses are full of <u>hopeless</u> students who do not feel they can materially affect their present or their future. The danger that this pattern will continue beyond their collegiate years should frighten us all.

2. Students are even more notorious than faculty for becoming entrapped in their own organizational patterns. When they find representative or democratic structures frustrating and cumbersome, withdrawal is the common response.

3. While asserting their complete independency and freedom, the majority of students continue to be very anxious for approval from adults. Even the most militant, anti-authoritarian students seem to be engaged in a quest for adults whom they can trust.

4. The sense of impermanence hovers constantly over student groups. The fear that what isn't done today won't be done at all is pervasive. Year after next is inconceivable to freshmen, too late for sophomores, and a never-never land for juniors and seniors.

5. Faculty members are, for the most part, too intent upon their own work and careers to have gained more than a random impression of the student culture. They are generally unfamiliar with current innovations in higher education and with the research presently being conducted. And it may be that their time is too limited for systematic inquiry.

6. Faculty members, students, and administrators are prone to lapse into adversary proceedings when dealing with one another. Each tends to be so encapsulated within his own world that he has little familiarity with or sensitivity to the problems of the other.

Particular talents are necessary for dealing with these problems: skill in counseling, skill in organizing, skill in listening, skill in displaying supportive attitudes. As I understand it, these are skills you are supposed to possess. Recently with one of my classes I was studying a novel of Saul Bellow's. I am inclined to enjoin you with the title of that novel: Seize the Day. That does sound like high school oratory, but I prefer it to the plight of the protagonist who finds himself at the funeral of a total stranger, weeping copiously for his own mortality.

I do not assume that the reasons I have advanced for student participation in the shaping of the curriculum will be convincing to some members of the faculty or to all of you here. The possible consequences of failing to involve students in that process, however, include heightened antagonism, increased dissent, and continued ignorance on their part of the complexities of academic decision making as well as the survival of a curriculum addressed too frequently to the needs of a faculty rather than those of

students. The problem of increased dissent can, of course, be dealt with; but in our concern to maintain order, we may destroy the very idea of a university. The other possible consequences cause me equal concern, for students do need to discover for themselves vying conceptions of education and they must have a curriculum addressed to their own needs, needs which differ substantially from those of students of the thirties or forties. Not only can I envision members of this professional association making contributions to the solution of these problems, I see that as a necessity. You will make such contributions only as you see yourself as integral to the educational process rather than on its periphery and convey that conviction to the members of the faculties and administrations with whom you work.